Douglas Partners Pty Ltd
ABN 75 053 980 117
www.douglaspartners.com.au
96 Hermitage Road
West Ryde NSW 2114
PO Box 472
West Ryde NSW 1685
Phone (02) 9809 0666
Fax (02) 9809 4095

Tooheys Pty Ltd
29 Nyrang Street
Lidcombe NSW 2141

Project 71021.13
12 September 2018
71021.13.R.001.Rev0
LT:mm

Attention: Paul Kiely

Email: paul.kiely@lionco.com

Dear Sir

August 2018 - Groundwater Monitoring
Tooheys Brewery - 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe

1. Introduction

This letter report provides the laboratory results and a brief discussion of the August 2018 round of groundwater monitoring at the Tooheys Brewery site at 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe.

The objectives of the groundwater monitoring programme are to assess whether any groundwater contamination identified on site in 2006 is migrating off site and to address the conditions of approval for groundwater monitoring set by the NSW Department of Planning as part of the approval for the upgrade and continued operation of the site under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

As stated in Douglas Partners Pty Ltd's (DP) report *First Round of 2011 Groundwater Monitoring, Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* 7 June 2011, ref: 71021.03, a Phase 1 contamination assessment was conducted by DP in 2006. The results of the soil sampling and analysis conducted by DP in November and December 2006 indicated elevated total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) concentrations in samples collected from boreholes adjacent to the fuel underground storage tanks (USTs) for the former boiler (the former boiler USTs). Elevated TPH and toluene concentrations were detected in groundwater samples collected from the well adjacent to the former boiler USTs (BH6C). Elevated TPH concentrations were also detected in the groundwater samples collected from the well adjacent to the refuelling USTs (BH1).

Four additional groundwater wells were installed at the boundary of the site in order to determine whether the identified contamination was migrating off site (DP report on *Field Investigation Phase 1 Contamination Assessment, 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* March 2007, ref: 44359). Further rounds of groundwater monitoring have been undertaken by DP as follows:

- *Groundwater Monitoring Report, 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe*, January 2010, ref: 71021.00;
- *Groundwater Monitoring Report, 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe*, January 2011 ref: 71021.01;

- *First Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* June 2011 ref: 71021.03;
- *Second Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* November 2011 ref: 71021.03;
- *First Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* June 2012 ref: 71021.06;
- *Second Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* October 2012 ref: 71021.06;
- *First Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* May 2013 ref: 71021.07;
- *Second Round of Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* November 2013 ref: 71021.07;
- *2014 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* July 2014 ref: 71021.08;
- *2015 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* December 2015 ref: 71021.10;
- *January 2016 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* February 2016 ref: 71021.10;
- *January / February 2017 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* 6 March 2017 ref: 71021.11.R.001.Rev0;
- *March 2017 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* 13 April 2017 ref: 71021.11.R.002.Rev;
- *August 2017 Groundwater Monitoring Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* 15 September 2017 ref: 71021.12.R001.Rev0; and
- *November 2017 Groundwater Monitoring, Tooheys Brewery – 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* 1 December 2017 ref: 71021.12.R.002.Rev0.

2. Site Information

The brewery is located at 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe, within the Local Government Area of Cumberland and comprises a roughly rectangular area of approximately 6.2 hectares (ha). The site is contained within Lot 10 DP 1008367. It is zoned 4(a) Industrial Enterprise and is surrounded by industrial sites to the north, west and south and a residential area to the east.

Haslams Creek is located to the immediate west of the site and flows in approximately a northerly direction. To the north of the site the creek bends to the east and flows to the northeast and discharges into Homebush Bay located approximately 3.5 km downstream from the brewery. The portion of Haslams Creek adjacent to the brewery is a concrete lined stormwater channel.

The site is used for the production and storage of Tooheys beer, which is transported and distributed by trucks to various outlets. The majority of the site is occupied by large warehouse structures and large fermentation, maturation and storage tanks/silos. A site drawing and borehole location plan are presented in Drawing 1, attached.

Six decommissioned USTs were located along the northern boundary of the utility building. The USTs are reported to have been emptied 17 years ago when the boilers were converted to natural gas. It was reported by ARUP that in September 2008, Tooheys decommissioned the six former boiler USTs *in situ*, which involved removal of the residual water/fuel mix inside the tanks and foam filling.

A further three USTs were located on the north eastern boundary of the site which were formerly used for the storage of petrol or diesel for on-site vehicle refuelling. A concrete plinth and awning structure indicated that a bowser was also located nearby. Monitoring Wells BH1 and BH2 are located to the east and west of the UST and petrol bowser respectively. It was reported that the former refuelling UST were decommissioned *in situ* by being sand filled and capped approximately 20 years ago.

DP prepared a remediation action plan (RAP) for the removal and validation of the above three USTs on the north-east boundary. The RAP was entitled *Remediation Action Plan, 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe,* October 2011, ref 71021.02 Revision 2. The subsequent remediation and validation for the underground petroleum storage system (UPSS) in this area was undertaken shortly after the completion of the second round of groundwater monitoring for 2011 carried out on 21 October, 2011. The procedure and results of the remediation and validation of the UPSS in the north eastern boundary area were reported separately in, *UPSS Validation Assessment, Tooheys Brewery, 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe*, project reference 71021.04, dated February 2012. The successful validation was subject to a Site Audit undertaken by ENVIRON Australia Pty Ltd.

3. Groundwater Default Guideline Values

Groundwater Default Guideline Values (DGV) have been sourced from the ANZAST *Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality* (2018) default guideline values for toxicants in fresh waters for the protection of 95% of species. It is noted that the groundwater investigation levels (GIL) for groundwater monitoring rounds prior to the August 2018 were sourced from the ANZECC *Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (*2000), trigger values for toxicants in fresh waters for the protection of 95% of species.

It is noted that as of 29 August 2018, the *Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality* (ANZAST 2018) revoked the documents listed below.

- The Australian Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Waters (ANZECC, November 1992); and
- The Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, October 2000).

Previously, in the absence of ANZECC (2000) criteria for total recoverable hydrocarbons (TRH) and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), the laboratory limits of reporting were adopted as the screening criteria as nominated for the auditor-approved RAP GILs. In order to be consistent with the adopted modified values and with the EPL, the continued use of laboratory limits of reporting for TRH and TPH have continued to be used. It is noted, as a result, that the GIL values for TRH/TPH are more stringent to those adopted in earlier groundwater monitoring rounds (pre November 2011).

The current adopted DGV are given in Table 1 for the contaminants of concern.

Table 1: Groundwater Default Guideline Values (DGV) and Rationale

Contaminant	Adopted Criteria (GIL) µg/L	Source
Metals Arsenic (V) Cadmium Chromium (VI) Copper Lead Mercury Nickel Zinc	 13.0 2.4 33.1 1.4 121.1 0.6 120.2 284.9	ANZSAST (2018) Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality for the protection of 95% of freshwater species The threshold levels have been adjusted for extremely hard water in accordance with the guidelines
TRH/TPH $C_6 – C_9$ $>C_9$ $>C_{10} – C_{16}$	 10 250 50	Screening DGV (at limit of reporting) – require further investigation if exceeded
BTEX Benzene Toluene Ethylbenzene Xylene	 950 180 80 550	ANZAST (2018) Australian Water Quality Guidelines for the protection of 95% of freshwater species Reliability of DGV for toluene and ethylbenzene is unknown GIL for xylene is the sum of o-xylene and p-xylene default guideline values

4. Groundwater Monitoring Methodology and Field Observations

4.1 Identification of Wells

The locations of the six existing wells labelled BH1, BH2, BH7, BH8, BH9 and BH10 along the western and northern boundaries of the site are presented in the attached Drawing 1.

4.2 Frequency of Sampling

The groundwater monitoring wells BH1, BH2, BH7, BH8, BH9 and BH10 have now been sampled once in 2015, 2016, four times in 2017 and once in 2018 (September). Prior and up to 2013, monitoring was conducted twice a year on a six monthly interval during April and October and then as of 2014 has been once a year. The reduction in the monitoring frequency was due to previous results being within the DGVs and an understanding that no further rounds of monitoring were required as of 2014. However, Tooheys has requested the continued monitoring until such time as their licencing conditions are changed.

4.3 Well Development

Prior to collecting groundwater samples, each well was fully developed on 24 August 2018 using a submersible 12V pump in order to remove stagnant water and to provide good hydraulic connectivity to the local groundwater system. The exception was monitoring well BH7 that was developed with a peristaltic pump as the submersible 12V pump was unable to be lowered beyond a bend in the pipe. Well development was achieved by the removal of a minimum of three well volumes of water or until the well was dry, whichever was the lesser. Monitoring wells BH7, BH9 and BH10 became dry during purging. All wells were left to equilibrate to the groundwater over a 4 day period.

It is noted that at the time of the development, BH9 was covered with grey coloured silty water within the gatic cover although the well plug was in place. Similarly, BH10 was buried in sediment, with the well plug in place and visible oil based liquid (possible diesel or petrol from forklifts and trucks on site) on the surface of the asphalt adjacent to the well. There is a possibility that surface water may have entered the two aforementioned wells.

4.4 Collection of Groundwater Samples

The collection of groundwater samples from each of the six monitoring wells was carried out in accordance with the methodology as set out in the DP *Field Procedures Manual*. Groundwater sampling was undertaken on 28 August 2018 by a DP Environmental Engineer using a low flow peristaltic pump. Samples were taken from near the middle of the screened section, being close to the middle of the water column. The sampling programme included 10% field replicates for QA/QC purposes.

The samples were collected after stable readings were obtained for pH, conductivity, temperature and dissolved oxygen. Samples were carefully pumped into laboratory prepared sample containers including hydrochloric acid preserved BTEX vials. The groundwater samples collected for heavy metal testing were filtered in the field using a 45µm filter. Completed field sheets are attached to this report.

No phase separated hydrocarbons (PSH) were noted in the groundwater collected in all wells sampled in this monitoring round.

Sample containers were labelled and stored in the field and transported in an esky cooled with ice and later stored in a fridge at the office or laboratory. The samples were delivered to a NATA accredited laboratory, EnviroLab Services (ELS), together with chain-of-custody records.

4.5 Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC)

QA/QC sampling and analysis included the analysis of one replicate sample and one Trip Blank and Trip Spike for each groundwater monitoring event in the monitoring programme.

Inter-laboratory replicate analysis was conducted as a check of the reproducibility of results between the primary laboratory ELS as a measure of consistency of sampling techniques.

The comparative results of analysis between original and intra-laboratory replicate sample are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: RPD Results – Inter-laboratory Results

Well		BH2	BD1/20180828	Difference	RPD (%)
Heavy Metals	As	<1	<1	0	0
	Cd	<0.1	<0.1	0	0
	Cr	<1	<1	0	0
	Cu	3	<1	0	0
	Pb	<1	<1	0	0
	Hg	<0.05	<0.05	0	0
	Ni	3	3	0	0
	Zn	12	9	3	29
TRH	C6-C9	<10	<10	0	0
	C10-C36	<250	<250	0	0
	>C10-C16	<50	<50	0	0
Benzene		<1	<1	0	0
Toluene		<1	<1	0	0
Ethyl-Benzene		<1	<1	0	0
Total Xylene		<3	<3	0	0

*BD1/20180828 = Blind replicate sample of BH2

The calculated RPD were all within the acceptable range of ± 30 for inorganic analytes and ± 50% for organics. Therefore the inter-laboratory replicate comparisons indicate that the sampling technique

was generally consistent and repeatable and the two laboratory sampling handling and analytical methods are comparable.

A trip spike and trip blank were also analysed and the results indicated that appropriate transport and handling techniques were adopted.

4.6 Laboratory Analysis

The groundwater samples (including QA/QC samples) were sent for the following analysis at a NATA accredited laboratory:

- Heavy metals (arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel and zinc);
- Total recoverable hydrocarbons (TRH); and
- Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene (BTEX).

Table 3 shows the analytical scheme for the groundwater samples.

Table 3: Analytical Scheme for Groundwater Samples

Sample ID	Heavy Metals	TRH	BTEX
BH1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10	✓	✓	✓
BD1/20180828*	✓	✓	✓
Spike / Blank			✓

*BD2/20180828 = Blind duplicate sample of BH2

5. Results

5.1 Field Testing Results

Piezometric levels were measured prior to development and prior to sampling from the groundwater wells. The measured levels are summarised in Table 4. The groundwater flow direction is shown to be in a north westerly direction, with the location of BH2 being hydraulically down-gradient from the former location of the UPSS near the north eastern boundary of the property.

Table 4: Piezometric Levels

Monitoring Well	m AHD (surface)	Date			
		24/08/2018 (well development)		28/08/2018 (groundwater sampling)	
		m bgl	m AHD	m bgl	m AHD
1	6.46	2.70	3.76	2.82	3.64
2	6.25	3.03	3.22	2.89	3.36
7	6.38	3.83	2.55	4.10	2.28
8	6.50	5.02	1.48	4.99	1.51
9	6.00	4.40	1.60	4.35	1.65
10	5.12	1.95	3.17	4.16	0.96

m bgl: metres below ground level
m AHD: level in metres above Australian Height Datum

The water level appeared to have recovered to the equilibrium level or close to the equilibrium level after development in each of the wells.

Groundwater samples were noted to be clear. Samples were taken after stable readings were obtained for pH, conductivity, temperature and dissolved oxygen as presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Groundwater Readings Prior to Sampling

Monitoring Well	Dissolved Oxygen (ppm)	Conductivity (µS/cm)	pH	Redox (mV)	Temperature (ºC)
1	0.39	6250	6.10	79	20.2
2	2.56	14110	6.71	27	19.3
7*	1.92	2043	6.26	32	18.3
8	0.47	23.32	6.05	175	21.8
9*	1.24	10360	6.37	195	19.7
10*	1.03	11910	6.44	89	17.9

*Monitoring Well 7, 9 and 10 were sampled prior to achieving stabilised readings due to the low expected bore volume.

5.2 Analytical Results

Tables 6 to 12 attached provide the results of groundwater testing in July 2014, October 2015, January 2016, January, March, August and November 2017 for reference purposes. The laboratory results of the current groundwater samples plus the QA/QC results are summarised in the attached Table 13. The laboratory test results certificates and chain-of-custody information are attached.

6. Discussion

Concentrations of TRH and BTEX were reported below the laboratory limits of reporting for all monitoring wells sampled during this round of sampling with the exception of BH10.

Monitoring well BH10 had a concentration of C6 to C9 hydrocarbons of 22 µg/L which exceeded the adopted DGV of 10 µg/L and a concentration of >C10-C16 hydrocarbons of 230 µg/L which exceeded the adopted DGV of 50 µg/L. Furthermore, BH10 also had concentrations of C10 to C14 hydrocarbons of 190 µg/L, C15 to C28 hydrocarbons of 610 µg/L which (if the PQL is adopted for the other TRH fraction C29 to C36) is equivalent to C10 to C36 TRH concentration of 450 µg/L which is a slight exceedance of the adopted DGV (250 µg/L). It is noted that the concentration is similar to that detected in both January/February 2017 (which was 370 µg/L) and October 2015 (which was 20 µg/L).

It is noted that an oil (possible diesel or petrol) based liquid was visible on the ground surface adjacent to the well at the time of development. Therefore, it is also possible that recent rain allowed the migration of the oil through the sediment that had at the time, buried the well, and into the well itself. Further monitoring of the TRH levels in the well will continue for persisting exceedances and to assist in determining if the source is from the groundwater or surface water contamination.

Concentrations of heavy metals were reported either below their respective laboratory limits of reporting or DGV in all six samples during this monitoring round with the exception of copper and zinc. Copper was recorded in all wells BH1 (3 µg/L), BH2, (3 µg/L), BH7 (4 µg/L), BH8 (10 µg/L), BH9 (5 µg/L) and BH10 (3 µg/L) exceeding the DGV of 1.4 µg/L. The zinc concentration in BH7 (670 µg/L) exceeded the DGV of 284.9 µg/L.

In the previous round (November 2017) arsenic in BH7 was above the DGV and has periodically been detected with this as the first instance above the DGV and it below the DGV in this round of monitoring. These results are not considered to be significant since arsenic, copper and zinc are not primary target contaminants associated with the UPSS, although arsenic, copper and zinc levels will continue to be monitored for persisting exceedances in future monitoring rounds.

7. Conclusion

Based on the current round of groundwater monitoring at the site, the laboratory results indicate that the groundwater is not significantly impacted by petroleum hydrocarbon contamination.

The results are generally consistent with the previous monitoring rounds with the exception of BH10. It is noted that a slightly elevated concentration of TRH was also detected in MW10 in January/February 2017, although it was below the detection limits in the ensuing rounds for 2017. It is recommended that additional monitoring rounds be conducted to further assess the potential for increasing petroleum hydrocarbon contamination at BH10. It is noted that the next round of monitoring is scheduled for October 2018 at the request of the client.

8. Limitations

Douglas Partners (DP) has prepared this report for this project at 29 Nyrang Street, Lidcombe in accordance with DP's proposal (SYD180718) dated 16 July 2018 and acceptance received from Mr Paul Kiely of Tooheys Pty Ltd dated 7 August 2018 (Order No. BP263138). The work was carried out under DP's Conditions of Engagement. This report is provided for the exclusive use of Tooheys Pty Ltd for this project only and for the purposes as described in the report. It should not be used by or relied upon for other projects or purposes on the same or other site or by a third party. Any party so relying upon this report beyond its exclusive use and purpose as stated above, and without the express written consent of DP, does so entirely at its own risk and without recourse to DP for any loss or damage. In preparing this report DP has necessarily relied upon information provided by the client and/or their agents.

The results provided in the report are indicative of the sub-surface conditions on the site only at the specific sampling and/or testing locations, and then only to the depths investigated and at the time the work was carried out. Sub-surface conditions can change abruptly due to variable geological processes and also as a result of human influences. Such changes may occur after DP's field testing has been completed.

DP's advice is based upon the conditions encountered during this investigation. The accuracy of the advice provided by DP in this report may be affected by undetected variations in ground conditions across the site between and beyond the sampling and/or testing locations. The advice may also be limited by budget constraints imposed by others or by site accessibility.

This report must be read in conjunction with all of the attached and should be kept in its entirety without separation of individual pages or sections. DP cannot be held responsible for interpretations or conclusions made by others unless they are supported by an expressed statement, interpretation, outcome or conclusion stated in this report.

This report, or sections from this report, should not be used as part of a specification for a project, without review and agreement by DP. This is because this report has been written as advice and opinion rather than instructions for construction.

The contents of this report do not constitute formal design components such as are required, by the Health and Safety Legislation and Regulations, to be included in a Safety Report specifying the hazards likely to be encountered during construction and the controls required to mitigate risk. This design process requires risk assessment to be undertaken, with such assessment being dependent upon factors relating to likelihood of occurrence and consequences of damage to property and to life. This, in turn, requires project data and analysis presently beyond the knowledge and project role respectively of DP. DP may be able, however, to assist the client in carrying out a risk assessment of potential hazards contained in the Comments section of this report, as an extension to the current scope of works, if so requested, and provided that suitable additional information is made available to DP. Any such risk assessment would, however, be necessarily restricted to the groundwater components set out in this report and to their application by the project designers to project design, construction, maintenance and demolition.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions on this matter.

Yours faithfully
Douglas Partners Pty Ltd

Lisa Teng
Environmental Engineer

Reviewed by

Paul Gorman
Principal

Attachments: Notes About this Report
Drawing 1
Results of Laboratory Analysis, Tables 6 – 13
Certified Laboratory Reports, Chain of Custody Documentation and Sample Receipt Advice
Field Notes

About this Report

Douglas Partners

Introduction

These notes have been provided to amplify DP's report in regard to classification methods, field procedures and the comments section. Not all are necessarily relevant to all reports.

DP's reports are based on information gained from limited subsurface excavations and sampling, supplemented by knowledge of local geology and experience. For this reason, they must be regarded as interpretive rather than factual documents, limited to some extent by the scope of information on which they rely.

Copyright

This report is the property of Douglas Partners Pty Ltd. The report may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Conditions of Engagement for the commission supplied at the time of proposal. Unauthorised use of this report in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Borehole and Test Pit Logs

The borehole and test pit logs presented in this report are an engineering and/or geological interpretation of the subsurface conditions, and their reliability will depend to some extent on frequency of sampling and the method of drilling or excavation. Ideally, continuous undisturbed sampling or core drilling will provide the most reliable assessment, but this is not always practicable or possible to justify on economic grounds. In any case the boreholes and test pits represent only a very small sample of the total subsurface profile.

Interpretation of the information and its application to design and construction should therefore take into account the spacing of boreholes or pits, the frequency of sampling, and the possibility of other than 'straight line' variations between the test locations.

Groundwater

Where groundwater levels are measured in boreholes there are several potential problems, namely:

- In low permeability soils groundwater may enter the hole very slowly or perhaps not at all during the time the hole is left open;
- A localised, perched water table may lead to an erroneous indication of the true water table;
- Water table levels will vary from time to time with seasons or recent weather changes. They may not be the same at the time of construction as are indicated in the report; and
- The use of water or mud as a drilling fluid will mask any groundwater inflow. Water has to be blown out of the hole and drilling mud must first be washed out of the hole if water measurements are to be made.

More reliable measurements can be made by installing standpipes which are read at intervals over several days, or perhaps weeks for low permeability soils. Piezometers, sealed in a particular stratum, may be advisable in low permeability soils or where there may be interference from a perched water table.

Reports

The report has been prepared by qualified personnel, is based on the information obtained from field and laboratory testing, and has been undertaken to current engineering standards of interpretation and analysis. Where the report has been prepared for a specific design proposal, the information and interpretation may not be relevant if the design proposal is changed. If this happens, DP will be pleased to review the report and the sufficiency of the investigation work.

Every care is taken with the report as it relates to interpretation of subsurface conditions, discussion of geotechnical and environmental aspects, and recommendations or suggestions for design and construction. However, DP cannot always anticipate or assume responsibility for:

- Unexpected variations in ground conditions. The potential for this will depend partly on borehole or pit spacing and sampling frequency;
- Changes in policy or interpretations of policy by statutory authorities; or
- The actions of contractors responding to commercial pressures.

If these occur, DP will be pleased to assist with investigations or advice to resolve the matter.

About this Report

Site Anomalies

In the event that conditions encountered on site during construction appear to vary from those which were expected from the information contained in the report, DP requests that it be immediately notified. Most problems are much more readily resolved when conditions are exposed rather than at some later stage, well after the event.

Information for Contractual Purposes

Where information obtained from this report is provided for tendering purposes, it is recommended that all information, including the written report and discussion, be made available. In circumstances where the discussion or comments section is not relevant to the contractual situation, it may be appropriate to prepare a specially edited document. DP would be pleased to assist in this regard and/or to make additional report copies available for contract purposes at a nominal charge.

Site Inspection

The company will always be pleased to provide engineering inspection services for geotechnical and environmental aspects of work to which this report is related. This could range from a site visit to confirm that conditions exposed are as expected, to full time engineering presence on site.





Locality Plan

LEGEND

- Test Bore Location
- P Piezometer
- Monitoring Well

SCALE
0 50 100m
1:1500

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics • Environment • Groundwater

CLIENT: Tooheys Pty Ltd		
DRAWN BY: PSCH	SCALE: As shown	OFFICE: Sydney
APPROVED BY:		DATE: 30.07.2014

TITLE: **Location of Monitoring Wells**
Groundwater Monitoring
29 Nyrang Street, LIDCOMBE

PROJECT No:	71021.08
DRAWING No:	1
REVISION:	0

Table 6: Results of Laboratory Analysis in July 2014 (µg/L)

Well	Hardness (mg $CaCO_3$ /L)	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH		Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
		As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{36}				
1	130	<1	<0.1	<1	1	<1	<0.05	4	82	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
[2]BD1/ 180714		<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	3	74	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	890	<1	0.2	<1	4	<1	<0.05	9	110	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	100	<1	<0.1	<1	3	<1	<0.05	6	28	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	1900	<1	0.2	<1	3	<1	<0.05	4	18	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	350	<1	<0.1	<1	1	<1	<0.05	2	18	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	380	<1	<0.1	<1	4	<1	<0.05	6	24	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
TS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101%	104%	102%	105%[4]
TB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL		13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

5 After silica gel clean-up

bold exceeds GIL

Table 7: Results of Laboratory Analysis in October 2015 (µg/L)

Well	Hardness (mg $CaCO_3$ /L)	Heavy Metals[1]								TPH		Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
		As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{36}				
1	670	2	<0.1	<1	4	<1	<0.05	7	55	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
[2]BD1/ 301015		2	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	1	19	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	1000	<1	0.2	<1	2	<1	<0.05	10	50	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	180	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	6	14	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	2300	<1	0.7	<1	4	<1	<0.05	4	17	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	420	<1	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	7	36	<10	<250	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	160	5	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	9	8	<10	520	<1	<1	<1	<3
TS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81%	92%	98%	104%[4]
TB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<10	-	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL		13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 8: Results of Laboratory Analysis in January 2016 (µg/L)

Well	Hardness (mg $CaCO_3$ /L)	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH			Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
		As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{36}	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	360	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	<1	12	<10	<250	66	<1	<1	<1	<3
[2]BD1/ 180714		2	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	<1	15	<10	<250	79	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	720	<1	0.2	<1	3	<1	<0.05	14	120	<10	<250	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	110	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	8	13	<10	<250	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	1900	<1	0.3	<1	4	<1	<0.05	4	18	<10	<250	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	480	<1	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	5	43	<10	<250	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	170	4	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	2	5	<10	<250	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
TS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94%	95%	92%	93%[4]
TB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<10	-	-	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL		13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250	50	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 9: Results of Laboratory Analysis in January / February 2017 (µg/L)

Well	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH					Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
	As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{14}	C_{15}-C_{28}	C_{29}-C36	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	1	<0.1	<1	1	<1	<0.05	4	28	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	<1	0.2	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	5	20	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	6	1	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	<1	0.5	<1	6	<1	<0.05	4	14	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	<1	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	8	38	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
BD1	<1	<0.1	<1	1	<1	<0.05	8	34	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	3	<0.1	<1	7	<1	<0.05	50	**150**	<10	<50	**220**	<100	**98**	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL	13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250			50	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 10: Results of Laboratory Analysis in March 2017 (µg/L)

Well	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH					Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
	As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{14}	C_{15}-C_{28}	C_{29}-C36	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	2	<0.1	<1	1	<1	<0.05	10	90	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
BD1	2	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	11	92	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	<1	<0.1	<1	3	<1	<0.05	5	38	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	8	2	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	<1	<0.1	<1	4	<1	<0.05	4	16	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	1	<0.1	<1	3	<1	<0.05	7	42	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	2	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	4	33	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL	13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250			50	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 11: Results of Laboratory Analysis in August 2017 (µg/L)

Well	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH					Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
	As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{14}	C_{15}-C_{28}	C_{29}-C36	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	5	19	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	4	12	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
BD1	<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	4	13	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	9	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	17	19	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	<1	1	<1	**27**	<1	<0.05	4	20	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	5	<0.1	<1	4	<1	<0.05	30	**420**	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	5	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	16	44	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL	13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250			50	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 12: Results of Laboratory Analysis in November 2017 (µg/L)

Well	Heavy Metals[1]								TRH					Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene
	As	Cd	Cr[3]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{14}	C_{15}-C_{28}	C_{29}-C36	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	<1	<0.1	<1	2	<1	<0.05	2	10	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	3	6	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
BD1/ 1511 2017	<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	3	5	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	**17**	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	24	69	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	<1	0.4	<1	11	<1	<0.05	3	14	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	7	82	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	3	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	3	12	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
GIL	13	3.5	14.1	21.7	205	0.6	171	124.3	10	250			50	950	180	80	550

Notes:

1 Heavy metals thresholds adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

2 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

3 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

4 (m+p)+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Table 13: Results of Laboratory Analysis in August 2018 (µg/L)

Well	Heavy Metals[2]								TRH					Benzene	Toluene	Ethyl-Benzene	Total Xylene[5]
	As	Cd	Cr[4]	Cu	Pb	Hg	Ni	Zn	C_6-C_9	C_{10}-C_{14}	C_{15}-C_{28}	C_{29}-C_{36}	>C_{10}-C_{16}				
1	1	<0.1	<1	**3**	<1	<0.05	5	30	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
2	<1	<0.1	<1	**3**	<1	<0.05	3	12	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
BD1/ 2018 0828[3]	<1	<0.1	<1	<1	<1	<0.05	3	9	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
7	11	0.8	<1	**4**	1	<0.05	77	**670**	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
8	<1	1.7	<1	**10**	<1	<0.05	3	21	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
9	2	<0.1	<1	**5**	<1	<0.05	7	110	<10	<50	<100	<100	<50	<1	<1	<1	<3
10	4	<0.1	<1	**3**	<1	<0.05	8	59	**22**	**190**	**610**	**<100**	**230**	8	<1	<1	<3
DGV[1]	13	2.4	33.1	1.4	121.1	0.6	120.2	284.9	10	250			50	950	180	80	550[5]

Notes:

1 DGV from the default guideline values provided in the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZAST, August 2018)

2 Heavy metal thresholds are adjusted for a hardness of 500 mg/L

3 Field replicate of sample listed immediately above

4 All chromium are assumed to exist in the stable Cr(III) oxidation state, as Cr(VI) will be too reactive and unstable under the normal environment.

5 m+p+o xylene

bold exceeds GIL

Envirolab Services Pty Ltd
ABN 37 112 535 645
12 Ashley St Chatswood NSW 2067
ph 02 9910 6200 fax 02 9910 6201
customerservice@envirolab.com.au
www.envirolab.com.au

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS 199446

Client Details

Client	Douglas Partners Pty Ltd
Attention	Kurt Plambeck, Lisa Teng
Address	96 Hermitage Rd, West Ryde, NSW, 2114

Sample Details

Your Reference	**71021.13, Tooheys, Lidcombe**
Number of Samples	9 Water
Date samples received	28/08/2018
Date completed instructions received	28/08/2018

Analysis Details

Please refer to the following pages for results, methodology summary and quality control data.

Samples were analysed as received from the client. Results relate specifically to the samples as received.

Results are reported on a dry weight basis for solids and on an as received basis for other matrices.

Report Details

Date results requested by	04/09/2018
Date of Issue	04/09/2018

NATA Accreditation Number 2901. This document shall not be reproduced except in full.

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025 - Testing. **Tests not covered by NATA are denoted with ***

Results Approved By
Jaimie Loa-Kum-Cheung, Senior Chemist
Steven Luong, Senior Chemist

Authorised By

Jacinta Hurst, Laboratory Manager

vTRH(C6-C10)/BTEXN in Water						
Our Reference		199446-1	199446-2	199446-3	199446-4	199446-5
Your Reference	UNITS	BH1	BH2	BH7	BH8	BH9
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water	Water	Water	Water
Date extracted	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Date analysed	-	30/08/2018	30/08/2018	30/08/2018	30/08/2018	30/08/2018
TRH C_6 - C_9	µg/L	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
TRH C_6 - C_{10}	µg/L	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
TRH C_6 - C_{10} less BTEX (F1)	µg/L	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
Benzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Toluene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
m+p-xylene	µg/L	<2	<2	<2	<2	<2
o-xylene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Naphthalene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Surrogate Dibromofluoromethane	%	102	100	101	102	99
Surrogate toluene-d8	%	93	93	95	93	95
Surrogate 4-BFB	%	96	96	99	98	95

vTRH(C6-C10)/BTEXN in Water					
Our Reference		199446-6	199446-7	199446-8	199446-9
Your Reference	UNITS	BH10	BD1/20180828	Spike	Blank
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water	Water	Water
Date extracted	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Date analysed	-	30/08/2018	30/08/2018	30/08/2018	30/08/2018
TRH C_6 - C_9	µg/L	22	<10	[NA]	<10
TRH C_6 - C_{10}	µg/L	22	<10	[NA]	<10
TRH C_6 - C_{10} less BTEX (F1)	µg/L	14	<10	[NA]	<10
Benzene	µg/L	8	<1	114%	<1
Toluene	µg/L	<1	<1	104%	<1
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	104%	<1
m+p-xylene	µg/L	<2	<2	103%	<2
o-xylene	µg/L	<1	<1	103%	<1
Naphthalene	µg/L	<1	<1	[NA]	<1
Surrogate Dibromofluoromethane	%	102	97	101	98
Surrogate toluene-d8	%	96	94	99	96
Surrogate 4-BFB	%	97	96	98	96

svTRH (C10-C40) in Water						
Our Reference		199446-1	199446-2	199446-3	199446-4	199446-5
Your Reference	UNITS	BH1	BH2	BH7	BH8	BH9
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water	Water	Water	Water
Date extracted	-	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	31/08/2018
Date analysed	-	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	31/08/2018	01/09/2018
TRH C_{10} - C_{14}	µg/L	<50	<50	<50	<50	<50
TRH C_{15} - C_{28}	µg/L	<100	<100	<100	<100	<100
TRH C_{29} - C_{36}	µg/L	<100	<100	<100	<100	<100
TRH >C_{10} - C_{16}	µg/L	<50	<50	<50	<50	<50
TRH >C_{10} - C_{16} less Naphthalene (F2)	µg/L	<50	<50	<50	<50	<50
TRH >C_{16} - C_{34}	µg/L	<100	<100	<100	<100	<100
TRH >C_{34} - C_{40}	µg/L	<100	<100	<100	<100	<100
Surrogate o-Terphenyl	%	82	91	90	102	92

svTRH (C10-C40) in Water			
Our Reference		199446-6	199446-7
Your Reference	UNITS	BH10	BD1/20180828
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water
Date extracted	-	31/08/2018	31/08/2018
Date analysed	-	01/09/2018	01/09/2018
TRH C_{10} - C_{14}	µg/L	190	<50
TRH C_{15} - C_{28}	µg/L	610	<100
TRH C_{29} - C_{36}	µg/L	<100	<100
TRH >C_{10} - C_{16}	µg/L	230	<50
TRH >C_{10} - C_{16} less Naphthalene (F2)	µg/L	230	<50
TRH >C_{16} - C_{34}	µg/L	490	<100
TRH >C_{34} - C_{40}	µg/L	<100	<100
Surrogate o-Terphenyl	%	111	91

HM in water - dissolved						
Our Reference		199446-1	199446-2	199446-3	199446-4	199446-5
Your Reference	UNITS	BH1	BH2	BH7	BH8	BH9
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water	Water	Water	Water
Date prepared	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Date analysed	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Arsenic-Dissolved	µg/L	1	<1	11	<1	2
Cadmium-Dissolved	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	0.8	1.7	<0.1
Chromium-Dissolved	µg/L	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Copper-Dissolved	µg/L	3	3	4	10	5
Lead-Dissolved	µg/L	<1	<1	1	<1	<1
Mercury-Dissolved	µg/L	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
Nickel-Dissolved	µg/L	5	3	77	3	7
Zinc-Dissolved	µg/L	30	12	670	21	110

HM in water - dissolved			
Our Reference		199446-6	199446-7
Your Reference	UNITS	BH10	BD1/20180828
Date Sampled		28/08/2018	28/08/2018
Type of sample		Water	Water
Date prepared	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Date analysed	-	29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Arsenic-Dissolved	µg/L	4	<1
Cadmium-Dissolved	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1
Chromium-Dissolved	µg/L	<1	<1
Copper-Dissolved	µg/L	3	<1
Lead-Dissolved	µg/L	<1	<1
Mercury-Dissolved	µg/L	<0.05	<0.05
Nickel-Dissolved	µg/L	8	3
Zinc-Dissolved	µg/L	59	9

Method ID	Methodology Summary
Metals-021	Determination of Mercury by Cold Vapour AAS.
Metals-022	Determination of various metals by ICP-MS.
Org-003	Soil samples are extracted with Dichloromethane/Acetone and waters with Dichloromethane and analysed by GC-FID. F2 = (>C10-C16)-Naphthalene as per NEPM B1 Guideline on Investigation Levels for Soil and Groundwater (HSLs Tables 1A (3, 4)). Note Naphthalene is determined from the VOC analysis.
Org-013	Water samples are analysed directly by purge and trap GC-MS.
Org-016	Soil samples are extracted with methanol and spiked into water prior to analysing by purge and trap GC-MS. Water samples are analysed directly by purge and trap GC-MS. F1 = (C6-C10)-BTEX as per NEPM B1 Guideline on Investigation Levels for Soil and Groundwater.

QUALITY CONTROL: vTRH(C6-C10)/BTEXN in Water						Duplicate			Spike Recovery %	
Test Description	Units	PQL	Method	Blank	#	Base	Dup.	RPD	LCS-W3	[NT]
Date extracted	-			29/08/2018	6	29/08/2018	30/08/2018		29/08/2018	[NT]
Date analysed	-			30/08/2018	6	30/08/2018	31/08/2018		30/08/2018	[NT]
TRH C_6 - C_9	µg/L	10	Org-016	<10	6	22	24	9	106	[NT]
TRH C_6 - C_{10}	µg/L	10	Org-016	<10	6	22	24	9	106	[NT]
Benzene	µg/L	1	Org-016	<1	6	8	8	0	122	[NT]
Toluene	µg/L	1	Org-016	<1	6	<1	<1	0	104	[NT]
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	1	Org-016	<1	6	<1	<1	0	101	[NT]
m+p-xylene	µg/L	2	Org-016	<2	6	<2	<2	0	101	[NT]
o-xylene	µg/L	1	Org-016	<1	6	<1	<1	0	100	[NT]
Naphthalene	µg/L	1	Org-013	<1	6	<1	<1	0	[NT]	[NT]
Surrogate Dibromofluoromethane	%		Org-016	97	6	102	101	1	95	[NT]
Surrogate toluene-d8	%		Org-016	98	6	96	95	1	98	[NT]
Surrogate 4-BFB	%		Org-016	96	6	97	98	1	101	[NT]

QUALITY CONTROL: svTRH (C10-C40) in Water						Duplicate			Spike Recovery %	
Test Description	Units	PQL	Method	Blank	#	Base	Dup.	RPD	LCS-W2	[NT]
Date extracted	-			31/08/2018	6	31/08/2018	31/08/2018		31/08/2018	[NT]
Date analysed	-			31/08/2018	6	01/09/2018	01/09/2018		31/08/2018	[NT]
TRH C_{10} - C_{14}	µg/L	50	Org-003	<50	6	190	190	0	90	[NT]
TRH C_{15} - C_{28}	µg/L	100	Org-003	<100	6	610	610	0	106	[NT]
TRH C_{29} - C_{36}	µg/L	100	Org-003	<100	6	<100	<100	0	77	[NT]
TRH >C_{10} - C_{16}	µg/L	50	Org-003	<50	6	230	220	4	90	[NT]
TRH >C_{16} - C_{34}	µg/L	100	Org-003	<100	6	490	500	2	106	[NT]
TRH >C_{34} - C_{40}	µg/L	100	Org-003	<100	6	<100	<100	0	77	[NT]
Surrogate o-Terphenyl	%		Org-003	89	6	111	110	1	125	[NT]

QUALITY CONTROL: HM in water - dissolved						Duplicate			Spike Recovery %	
Test Description	Units	PQL	Method	Blank	#	Base	Dup.	RPD	LCS-W1	199446-2
Date prepared	-			29/08/2018	1	29/08/2018	29/08/2018		29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Date analysed	-			29/08/2018	1	29/08/2018	29/08/2018		29/08/2018	29/08/2018
Arsenic-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	1	<1	0	96	[NT]
Cadmium-Dissolved	µg/L	0.1	Metals-022	<0.1	1	<0.1	<0.1	0	96	[NT]
Chromium-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	<1	<1	0	90	[NT]
Copper-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	3	3	0	98	[NT]
Lead-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	<1	<1	0	96	[NT]
Mercury-Dissolved	µg/L	0.05	Metals-021	<0.05	1	<0.05	<0.05	0	107	71
Nickel-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	5	5	0	93	[NT]
Zinc-Dissolved	µg/L	1	Metals-022	<1	1	30	30	0	94	[NT]

Result Definitions

NT	Not tested
NA	Test not required
INS	Insufficient sample for this test
PQL	Practical Quantitation Limit
<	Less than
>	Greater than
RPD	Relative Percent Difference
LCS	Laboratory Control Sample
NS	Not specified
NEPM	National Environmental Protection Measure
NR	Not Reported

Quality Control Definitions

Blank	This is the component of the analytical signal which is not derived from the sample but from reagents, glassware etc, can be determined by processing solvents and reagents in exactly the same manner as for samples.
Duplicate	This is the complete duplicate analysis of a sample from the process batch. If possible, the sample selected should be one where the analyte concentration is easily measurable.
Matrix Spike	A portion of the sample is spiked with a known concentration of target analyte. The purpose of the matrix spike is to monitor the performance of the analytical method used and to determine whether matrix interferences exist.
LCS (Laboratory Control Sample)	This comprises either a standard reference material or a control matrix (such as a blank sand or water) fortified with analytes representative of the analyte class. It is simply a check sample.
Surrogate Spike	Surrogates are known additions to each sample, blank, matrix spike and LCS in a batch, of compounds which are similar to the analyte of interest, however are not expected to be found in real samples.

Australian Drinking Water Guidelines recommend that Thermotolerant Coliform, Faecal Enterococci, & E.Coli levels are less than 1cfu/100mL. The recommended maximums are taken from "Australian Drinking Water Guidelines", published by NHMRC & ARMC 2011.

Laboratory Acceptance Criteria

Duplicate sample and matrix spike recoveries may not be reported on smaller jobs, however, were analysed at a frequency to meet or exceed NEPM requirements. All samples are tested in batches of 20. The duplicate sample RPD and matrix spike recoveries for the batch were within the laboratory acceptance criteria.

Filters, swabs, wipes, tubes and badges will not have duplicate data as the whole sample is generally extracted during sample extraction.

Spikes for Physical and Aggregate Tests are not applicable.

For VOCs in water samples, three vials are required for duplicate or spike analysis.

Duplicates: >10xPQL - RPD acceptance criteria will vary depending on the analytes and the analytical techniques but is typically in the range 20%-50% – see ELN-P05 QA/QC tables for details; <10xPQL - RPD are higher as the results approach PQL and the estimated measurement uncertainty will statistically increase.

Matrix Spikes, LCS and Surrogate recoveries: Generally 70-130% for inorganics/metals; 60-140% for organics (+/-50% surrogates) and 10-140% for labile SVOCs (including labile surrogates), ultra trace organics and speciated phenols is acceptable.

In circumstances where no duplicate and/or sample spike has been reported at 1 in 10 and/or 1 in 20 samples respectively, the sample volume submitted was insufficient in order to satisfy laboratory QA/QC protocols.

When samples are received where certain analytes are outside of recommended technical holding times (THTs), the analysis has proceeded. Where analytes are on the verge of breaching THTs, every effort will be made to analyse within the THT or as soon as practicable.

Where sampling dates are not provided, Envirolab are not in a position to comment on the validity of the analysis where recommended technical holding times may have been breached.

Measurement Uncertainty estimates are available for most tests upon request.

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

CHAIN OF CUSTODY DESPATCH SHEET

Project No:	71021.13	**Suburb:**	Lidcombe	**To:**	Envirolab
Project Name:	Tooheys	**Order Number**			12 Ashley Street, Chatswood
Project Manager:	Kurt Plambeck	**Sampler:**	LT	**Attn:**	Aileen Hie
Emails:	kurt.plambeck@douglaspartners.com.au	lisa.teng@douglaspartners.com.au		**Phone:**	
Date Required:	Standard ☐			**Email:**	

Prior Storage: ☐ Esky ☐ Fridge ☐ Shelved — Do samples contain 'potential' HBM? Yes ☐ No ☐ (If YES, then handle, transport and store in accordance with FPM HAZID)

	Sample ID	Lab ID	Date Sampled	Sample Type (S - soil, W - water)	Container Type (G - glass, P - plastic)	Analytes: Heavy Metals	OCP/OPP PCB	TRH and BTEX	PAH	Total Phenols	Asbestos 500 ml				Notes/preservation
1	BH1		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
2	BH2		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
3	BH7		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
4	BH8		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
5	BH9		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
6	BH10		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
7	BD1/20180828		28-Aug-18	W	G/P	X	X	X							
8	Spike		28-Aug-18	W	G/P			X							
9	Blank		28-Aug-18	W	G/P			X							
	PQL (S) mg/kg													**ANZECC PQLs req'd for all water analytes** ☐	

Envirolab Services
12 Ashley St
Chatswood NSW 2067
Ph: (02) 9910 6200

Job No: 199446
Date Received: 28.08.18
Time Received: 14:00
Received By:
Temp: Cool/Ambient
Cooling: Ice/Icepack
Security: Intact/Broken/None

PQL = practical quantitation limit. If none given, default to Laboratory Method Detection Limit

Metals to Analyse: 8HM unless specified here:

Lab Report/Reference No:

Total number of samples in container: | **Relinquished by:** | **Transported to laboratory by:**

Send Results to: Douglas Partners Pty Ltd | **Address:** | **Phone:** | **Fax:**

Signed: | **Received by:** Tanya Doherty | **Date & Time:** 28.08.18 14:00

Envirolab Services Pty Ltd
ABN 37 112 535 645
12 Ashley St Chatswood NSW 2067
ph 02 9910 6200 fax 02 9910 6201
customerservice@envirolab.com.au
www.envirolab.com.au

SAMPLE RECEIPT ADVICE

Client Details

Client	Douglas Partners Pty Ltd
Attention	Kurt Plambeck, Lisa Teng

Sample Login Details

Your reference	71021.13, Tooheys, Lidcombe
Envirolab Reference	199446
Date Sample Received	28/08/2018
Date Instructions Received	28/08/2018
Date Results Expected to be Reported	04/09/2018

Sample Condition

Samples received in appropriate condition for analysis	YES
No. of Samples Provided	9 Water
Turnaround Time Requested	Standard
Temperature on Receipt (°C)	17.2
Cooling Method	Ice Pack
Sampling Date Provided	YES

Comments

Nil

Please direct any queries to:

Aileen Hie	Jacinta Hurst
Phone: 02 9910 6200	**Phone: 02 9910 6200**
Fax: 02 9910 6201	**Fax: 02 9910 6201**
Email: ahie@envirolab.com.au	**Email: jhurst@envirolab.com.au**

Analysis Underway, details on the following page:

Envirolab Services Pty Ltd
ABN 37 112 535 645
12 Ashley St Chatswood NSW 2067
ph 02 9910 6200 fax 02 9910 6201
customerservice@envirolab.com.au
www.envirolab.com.au

Sample ID	vTRH(C6-C10)/BTEXN in Water	svTRH (C10-C40) in Water	OCP in water	OP Pesticides in water	PCBs in Water	HM in water - dissolved
BH1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BH2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BH7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BH8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BH9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BH10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
BD1/20180828	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Spike	✓					
Blank	✓					

The '✓' indicates the testing you have requested. **THIS IS NOT A REPORT OF THE RESULTS.**

Additional Info

Sample storage - Waters are routinely disposed of approximately 1 month and soils approximately 2 months from receipt.
Requests for longer term sample storage must be received in writing.

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details		
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH1**	
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring	
Project Number:	71021.13	
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe	
Bore RL	6.5 m AHD	
Bore Easting:		Northing:
Installation Date:	24-Oct-16	
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl	
Well Depth:	14.2 m bgl	
Screened Interval:	2.0-14.2 m bgl	
Contaminants/Comments:		
Bore Development Details		
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20~~ August 2018 Friday 24th. 12:20	
Purged By:	Lisa Teng	
GW Level (pre-purge):	2.70 m bgl	
GW Level (post-purge):	3.20 m bgl	
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick	Silty yellow orange water w/ orange brown particles.
Observed Well Depth:	13.97 m bgl	
Estimated Bore Volume:	81 L 240	
Total Volume Purged:	250 L	
Equipment:	12 Volt pump	
Micropurge and Sampling Details		
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018 28/8/18 Thurs. 9:25	
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng	
Weather Conditions:	cloudy/clear	
GW Level (pre-purge):	2.82 m bgl	
GW Level (post sample):	2.86 m bgl	
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick	
Observed Well Depth:	13.99 m bgl	
Estimated Bore Volume:	80.1 L	
Total Volume Purged:	7-8 L	
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter	

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	***0.1° C***	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
9:40	13.2	2.80	6.62	5.94	—	118
9:41	17.9	0.86	6.20	6.02	72.4	97
9:42	19.3	0.48	6.06	6.04	71.2	91
9:43	20.1	0.42	6.17	6.06	97.3	85
	20.2	0.46	6.18	6.07	102.2	83
	20.2	0.39	6.25	6.10	94.7	79
Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	8.5 m bgl, mid vol.
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	clear → very slightly silty (yellow brown)
Sample ID:	BH1
QA/QC Samples:	
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl) , 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details		
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH2**	
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring	
Project Number:	71021.13	
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe	
Bore RL	6.2 m AHD	
Bore Easting:		Northing:
Installation Date:	20-Oct-16	
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl	
Well Depth:	14.5 m bgl	
Screened Interval:	2.0-14.5 m bgl	
Contaminants/Comments:		
Bore Development Details		
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20~~ August 2018	10:25 am, 24/8/18 Friday
Purged By:	Lisa Teng	
GW Level (pre-purge):	3.03 m bgl	
GW Level (post-purge):	5.83 m bgl	
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick	
Observed Well Depth:	14.10 m bgl	
Estimated Bore Volume:	79.7 L	
Total Volume Purged:	250 ~~300~~ L	
Equipment:	12 Volt pump, twister pump, bailer & line, interfaces	
Micropurge and Sampling Details		
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018	28/8/18 Tues, 8:40AM
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng	
Weather Conditions:	Sunny with clouds	
GW Level (pre-purge):	2.89 m bgl	
GW Level (post sample):	2.94 m bgl	
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick	
Observed Well Depth:	14.10 m bgl	
Estimated Bore Volume:	80.4 L	
Total Volume Purged:	9-10 L	
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter	

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	***0.1° C***	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
9:00	11.5	4.71	11.42	6.54	204	99
9:01	15.1	2.95	13.92	6.64	54.2	62
9:02	17.3	2.76	14.00	6.65	~~204~~ 53	58
9:03	18.4	2.62	14.26	6.67	48.6	42
9:04	18.8	2.60	14.21	6.68	47.2	37
9:05	19.1	2.61	14.16	6.69	44.9	33
9:06	19.2	2.58	14.14	6.70	49.2	29
9:07	19.3	3.65	14.13	6.70	40.8	28
9:08	19.3	2.56	14.11	6.71	42.8	27
Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	8.5 m bgl, mid col
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	clear
Sample ID:	BH2
QA/QC Samples:	BD2/20180828
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl), 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details			
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH7**		
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring		
Project Number:	71021.13		
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe		
Bore RL	6.4 m AHD		
Bore Easting:		Northing:	
Installation Date:	7-Dec-16		
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl		
Well Depth:	6.5 m bgl		
Screened Interval:	1.5-6.5 m bgl		
Contaminants/Comments:			
Bore Development Details			
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20 August 2018~~ 24/8/18 Friday 7:45		
Purged By:	Lisa Teng		
GW Level (pre-purge):	3.83 m bgl		
GW Level (post-purge):	5.02 m bgl		
PSH observed: N/A	Yes / No (interface/visual). ? mm thick	no bail due to bend in pipe	
Observed Well Depth:	5.35 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	18 L		
Total Volume Purged:	10 L dry.		
Equipment:	12 Volt pump, peristaltic pump, interface, ~~tape & dipper~~		
Micropurge and Sampling Details			
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018 Tuesday 28th August 2018, 6:45 AM		
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng		
Weather Conditions:	slightly cloudy		
GW Level (pre-purge):	4.10 m bgl		
GW Level (post sample):	4.90 m bgl		
PSH observed: N/A	Yes / No (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	5.34 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	8.9 L		
Total Volume Purged:	2-3 L		
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter		

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	***0.1° C***	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
7:04	15.5	3.36	1886	5.82		113
7:05	17.6	2.23	2009	6.09		63
7:06	18.3	1.92	2043	6.26		32
well ran dry, no further recordings made						
Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	5.00 m bgl, mid col
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	clear, very slightly silty (yellow brown)
Sample ID:	BH7
QA/QC Samples:	—
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl) , 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	samples taken first due to shallow depth & low

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details			
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH8**		
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring		
Project Number:	71021.13		
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe		
Bore RL	6.5 m AHD		
Bore Easting:		Northing:	
Installation Date:	7-Dec-06		
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl		
Well Depth:	8.25 m bgl		
Screened Interval:	2.0-8.25 m bgl		
Contaminants/Comments:			
Bore Development Details			
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20~~ August 2018 8:40AM, 24th August 2018 Friday		
Purged By:	Lisa Teng		
GW Level (pre-purge):	5.02 m bgl		
GW Level (post-purge):	6.38 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	8.38 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	24.2 L 73.		
Total Volume Purged:	100 L		
Equipment:	12 Volt pump, bailer & line, interface.		
Micropurge and Sampling Details			
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018 7:20Am, Tues 28th Aug.		
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng		
Weather Conditions:	Sunny with clouds.		
GW Level (pre-purge):	4.99 m bgl		
GW Level (post sample):	5.15 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	8.26 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	23.5 L		
Total Volume Purged:	4-5 L		
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter		

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	***0.1° C***	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
7:35	12.4	1.81	25.07	5.97	67.2	202
7:36	18.8	0.94	23.54	6.02	64.5	191
7:37	20.8	0.7	23.23	6.03	53.2	184
7:38	21.5	0.58	23.26	6.04	47.8	178
7:39	21.8	0.47	23.32	6.05	42.1	175
Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	7.00 m bgl, mid col.
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	clear
Sample ID:	BH8
QA/QC Samples:	—
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl) , 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details			
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH9**		
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring		
Project Number:	71021.13		
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe		
Bore RL	6.0 m AHD		
Bore Easting:		Northing:	
Installation Date:	7 December 20016		
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl		
Well Depth:	6.5 m bgl		
Screened Interval:	1.5-6.5 m bgl		
Contaminants/Comments:			
Bore Development Details			
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20~~ August 2018 Friday 24th, 9:15 AM		
Purged By:	Lisa Teng		
GW Level (pre-purge):	4.40 m bgl		
GW Level (post-purge):	6.14 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	6.65 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	16.2 L		
Total Volume Purged:	60 L dry. 73		
Equipment:	12 Volt pump, tusher pump, bailer + line, interface		
Micropurge and Sampling Details			
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018 Tues 28th, 8:00 AM		
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng		
Weather Conditions:	Sunny with clouds.		
GW Level (pre-purge):	4.35 m bgl		
GW Level (post sample):	4.93 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	6.64 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	16.5 L		
Total Volume Purged:	5-6 L		
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter		

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	**0.1° C**	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
8:18	11.7	3.42	13.65	6.25	64.7	29
8:19	15.6	1.64	12.13	6.41	71.3	209
8:20	18.1	1.28	11.46	6.41	76.0	205
8:21	19.2	1.19	10.97	6.40	87.5	201
8:22	19.5	1.20	10.60	6.38	127.3	198
8:23	19.7	1.24	10.36	6.37	186.3	195

Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	5.5 m bgl, mid col.
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	very slightly salty (brown)
Sample ID:	BH9
QA/QC Samples:	
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl) , 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	23/8/18 - cloudy white water - water in gatic above well plug → grey silty water & slope, possible well plug not completely sealed. organic smell. → sample taken before readings due to low volume.

Douglas Partners
Geotechnics / Environment / Groundwater

Groundwater Field Sheet

Project and Bore Installation Details			
Bore / Standpipe ID:	**BH10**		
Project Name:	Tooheys August 2018 Monitoring		
Project Number:	71021.13		
Site Location:	29 Nyrnag Street, Lidcombe		
Bore RL	5.1 m AHD		
Bore Easting:		Northing:	
Installation Date:	7-Dec-06		
GW Level (during drilling):	m bgl		
Well Depth:	5 m bgl		
Screened Interval:	1.5-5.0 m bgl		
Contaminants/Comments:			
Bore Development Details			
Date/Time:	~~Tuesday 20~~ August 2018 Friday 24th, 11:30		
Purged By:	Lisa Teng		
GW Level (pre-purge):	1.95 m bgl		
GW Level (post-purge):	4.93 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick – slightly slippery feel.		
Observed Well Depth:	5.32 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	24.3 L		
Total Volume Purged:	17 L dry		
Equipment:	12 Volt pump, bailer & line, interface,		
Micropurge and Sampling Details			
Date/Time:	~~Thursday 22~~ August 2018 28/8/18 Tues, 10:05		
Sampled By:	Lisa Teng ~~doo~~		
Weather Conditions:	cloudy.		
GW Level (pre-purge):	4.16 m bgl		
GW Level (post sample):	4.92 m bgl		
PSH observed:	Yes / (No) (interface/visual). ? mm thick		
Observed Well Depth:	5.35 m bgl		
Estimated Bore Volume:	8.6 L		
Total Volume Purged:	3-4 L		
Equipment:	peristaltic pump and TPS multimeter		

Water Quality Parameters

Time / Volume	Temp (°C)	DO (mg/L)	EC (µS or mS/cm)	pH	Turbidity	Redox (mV)
Stabilisation Criteria (3 readings)	***0.1° C***	**+/- 0.3 mg/L**	**+/- 3%**	**+/- 0.1**	**+/- 10%**	**+/- 10 mV**
10:25	13.5	2.44	11.14	6.42		139
10:26	16.1	1.59	10.99	6.48		108
10:27	17.9	1.03	11.91	6.44		89
10:28	well ran dry,		no more readings taken.			
Additional Readings Following stabilisation:	DO % Sat	SPC	TDS			

Sample Details

Sampling Depth (rationale):	5.00 m bgl, mid col
Sample Appearance (e.g. colour, siltiness, odour):	Clear very slightly silty (yellow brown)
Sample ID:	BH10
QA/QC Samples:	
Sampling Containers and filtration:	500mL glass, 2x 40mL glass vials (HCl), 1x 100mL plastic (HNO3 (filtered)
Comments / Observations:	Samples taken first due to low volume.

need trowel → gate closing AT so it will S was buried in sediment.